

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-10, and 12-15 are currently pending. Claims 1-3, 7-9, and 12-15 have been rejected. Claims 4-6, and 10 have been indicated as allowable, and claim 11 has been cancelled.

The examiner is thanked for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 4-6, and 10. Because applicants believe that newly presented claim 1 is also patentable, the allowable claims have not been rewritten in independent form.

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Kayumi et al. (U. S. Publication No. 2004/56521). This rejection is traversed.

In the Office action of December 16, 2004, the examiner indicated that the certified copy of the priority documents had been received by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Because the priority document is not written in English, it is necessary under Rule 55(a)(4)(i)(B) to file a copy of a certified translation of the priority document to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). A copy of the certified translation of the text of the priority document FR 03 02009 of February 19, 2003 is attached. Copies of the drawings have not been included because the drawings contained in the certified copy have no non-English text. Because the priority date of this application is February 19, 2003, a date before the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) date of U. S. Publication No. 2004/56521, this rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

The examiner has also rejected claims 1,-3 7, 8, and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) s being anticipated by Smuk (U. S. Patent No. 6,152,533), this rejection as it applies to the claims currently pending is traversed.

The examiner will notice that claim 1 has been amended by incorporating claim 11 into claim 1. All claims are now dependent directly or indirectly on claim 1. The examiner did not reject claim 11 based on Smuk. Further, claim 1 includes the limitation that the bottom end of the front leg is directly mounted to the floor. As the examiner recognized, this is not disclosed or suggested by Smuk. Therefore, this rejection has been overcome and is no longer warranted.

Appl. No. 10/767,163
Response and Amdt. dated March 13, 2006
Reply to O.A. of December 2, 2005

Applicants believe that all outstanding issues with this application have been addressed by the foregoing amendments and the attached translation of the priority document. Therefore, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance. If the examiner has any remaining issues, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to resolve these issues.

Reconsideration and allowance of the foregoing claims are respectfully requested.

Deposit Account Authorization

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in any amount enclosed or any additional fees which may be required during the pendency of this application under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17, except issue fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1903.

Respectfully submitted,

McCracken & Frank LLP
200 W. Adams
Suite 2150
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 263-4700

By: 

March 13, 2006

J. William Frank, III
Reg. No: 25,626